

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BLOGGERS ROUNDTABLE WITH COLONEL LAURIE G. MOE BUCKHOUT, HEAD OF THE ELECTRONIC WARFARE DIVISION, VIA TELECONFERENCE SUBJECT: THE DESIGNATION OF THE NEW ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) 29-SERIES CAREER FIELD FOR OFFICERS, WARRANT OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL TIME: 2:00 P.M. EST DATE: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2009

Copyright (c) 2009 by Federal News Service, Inc., Ste. 500 1000 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA. Federal News Service is a private firm not affiliated with the federal government. No portion of this transcript may be copied, sold or retransmitted without the written authority of Federal News Service, Inc. Copyright is not claimed as to any part of the original work prepared by a United States government officer or employee as a part of that person's official duties. For information on subscribing to the FNS Internet Service, please visit <http://www.fednews.com> or call (202)347-1400

(Note: Please refer to www.dod.mil for more information.)

LINDY KYZER (Army Public Affairs): Again, this is Lindy Kyzer with Army Public Affairs. With us we have Rob Stewart with NCOcall.com, Chuck Simmins with America's North Shore Journal. And also we have Kico (sp). What was your last name again?

Q (Inaudible.)

MS. KYZER: I'm not going to be able to pronounce that. Can I just call you Kico?

Q That's why I use Kico. MS. KYZER: Okay. Great. (Chuckles.) We'll just stick with that. We're expecting three others, but they can join late and catch up. We'll go ahead and turn it over to Colonel Laurie Buckhout. She's the chief of the Electronic Warfare Division. So again will turn over to you, ma'am, and you can go ahead and begin with a minute or two of opening remarks.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Great. Thank you. First, thank you guys so much. Thanks for dialing up into this. This is always a good opportunity to talk about what we do. I would say, for openers, that in the last four or five years, the Army has really begun to open its eyes to the field of electronic warfare. We have been doing it for decades, but it's been primarily in a SIGINT or a collection role, or maybe in a special-purpose electronic attack and very surgical sophisticated capabilities. But in terms of really going out and blinding and deafening the enemy, we have not been doing that the way that we could.

The war in Iraq began to make us understand better, first I think with IEDs, that there are a lot of targets out there that we should be going after in an offensive mode or in a defensive mode to protect ourselves. The IEDs kind of became the focal point of EW and the tip of the iceberg, but then General Makodi (sp) quickly realized that it really was just the tip of the iceberg, as I said, and there's a whole lot more behind it that needed to be explored.

So he made a very revolutionary step. He stood up electronic warfare as a focal point in the Army staff, which has never been before, and he put it under the G-3, which is the operators, the folks who do operations and policy.

They represent the war fighter on a day-to-day basis. And he put it there because he said, quote, "We need to get out from behind the green door." And his point was is that it's more than SIGINT, it's more than collection capabilities; it's actually a suite that encompasses electronic attack, electronic protect, and then of course the SIGINT side and the targeting side as well.

So we stood up this office in May of 2006 and brought together a pretty sophisticated team to go after it. And at that point, we began to train, we began to work manning solutions, we began to work equipping solutions, which takes us to where we stand right now, which is the very recent approval of a new full-time cadre for electronic warfare in the Army, and that's going to be covering down on enlisted, warrant, and officer branches -- all three echelons in the Army, full-time professionals to the number of 1,619. And that covers active, reserve, and National Guard.

So a huge move, but what that does, it gives the Army the largest professional electronic warfare cadre of all of the services, and arguably one of the largest among the NATO countries. So we're doing pretty well. We understand the challenges that are out there, and we're wrapping our arms around them, and we are moving forward very quickly. So how is that for a start?

MS. KYZER: That's perfect, ma'am. We'll go ahead and take questions now. Rob, did you have a question?

Q Well, ma'am. Thank you. My name is Rob Stewart from NCO Call. Actually, you answered a couple of questions already. If I get this correctly, 1,619 are going to be the personnel in this new 29 series?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Master Sergeant, that is correct.

Q And that's including all of the different ranks as well as officer-enlisted warrant officers, and all three components.

COL. BUCKHOUT: That is correct. And that goes from right now sergeant E-5 up to colonel.

Q Outstanding. Now, where are you -- so you start out at E- 5. What (feet ?) or MOSs are going to be re-classed or have the opportunity to get this additional MOS? Are you taking those from the signal MOSs?

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know what, that's pretty wide open right now. It's going to be a volunteer and of course GT test sort of thing. We're getting a whole lot of volunteers from the field every day. NCOs, officers, and warrants all kind of want to play in this because they see it as certainly the way ahead to go from kinetics to non- kinetics, you know what I mean. So we're seeing young soldiers weighing in. Some of them are field artillery soldiers, some of them are signalers, some are intel guys, some are defenders. We're seeing across the gamut, but I would say the focus comes from the artillery guys because of their fires and targeting background, the signal guys because of their spectrum knowledge, and the intel guys, again because of their -- (inaudible, background noise) -- capabilities. Does that make sense?

Q Absolutely. Now, when it comes to the manning and the reserve components, when will that manning document, or is there a manning document right now telling the reserve units and the National Guard units this additional MOS, or when is that projected to be available as a manning document?

COL. BUCKHOUT: The notification of change, which is a document that goes around Department of the Army staff went out about two weeks ago to actually say this is now an official MOS. So what has to happen then is that all of the MTOs, TDAs, et cetera, have to be changed, and those are changed as HRC stands up the MOS, stands up the training, stands up the branch managers to actually put NCOs in their positions, et cetera. So it's sort of a rolling -- it's sort of a rolling process, because if you put all of the positions out there at once, what you would do is say, uh-oh, the Army is broke because we can't fill any of them yet because we don't have everybody trained yet, you know what I mean.

Q Right. Oh, yeah. I played the recruiting game for a while.

COL. BUCKHOUT: There you go. So --

Q And then also, because it is going to be -- and I'm assuming this is going to be a critical MOS?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Yes it is. Having the visibility of the vice -- the chief of staff of the Army, the G-3, and all kinds of senior folks, it's going to be a critical MOS. And I have no idea what that will call into as far as bonuses, et cetera -- you know, that's always a rolling thing. But I think soldiers can expect a tremendous challenge out of it.

Q Oh, absolutely. And I noticed that the training was going to be in Fort Sill.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Yes it is. Yes it is.

Q Now, what was the deciding factor there versus Gordon or Huachuca, because I believe Huachuca has an electronics warfare course for the officer if I remember correctly.

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know, Master Sergeant, you are correct. What Huachuca has focused on is that branch of electronic warfare called electronic support, and that's the targeting side that ties into SIGINT as well. It's a collection of intelligence to enable a rapid targeting. They are the undisputed experts in that area. What you have at Fort Sill are the undisputed experts in another area, which is fires. Now, the current policy above my level at OSD, Joint Staff, et cetera -- and it actually makes a lot of sense -- is that electronic attack, electronic warfare is a form of fires. So it's non-kinetics; it's effects, and the best effects integrators and fires planners in the United States Army are at Fort Sill. So that's how it went that way.

Q You're just catering to my field artillery side now. (Laughter.)

COL. BUCKHOUT: Okay, Redlag (ph).

MS. KYZER: Okay. Q So then you're saying that once this MOS is up and running, it's not going to be in the communications section; it will most likely go into the operations sections like the battalion and brigade level?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Amen. You got it. In fact, where it's built into the BCT cores and divisions right now, it's to the fires and effects section, so they're looking at the non-kinetic effects and effects coordination section for it.

MS. KYZER: Okay. Now I'm going to have to turn it over to somebody else for a while. But thanks for all of your questions, Rob. Chuck Simmins, did you have a question?

Q Yeah, I do. Being really O-L-D, I recall how Army aviation was -- the problem -- (inaudible) -- the field artillery, and now we see electronic warfare coming out of that same -- that same branch. My question is going to be are we actually setting up a duplicate program to something that perhaps the Air Force has with some of their overhead assets? I'm thinking JSTAR or some of the capabilities of the AWAX. I guess I'm not following how, you know, Joe Infantry man is going to benefit from the electronic warfare in the Army.

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know what, Chuck, that is a great question, and that has been a significant challenge, is to educate people exactly why that necessity exists. Here is the deal: The Air Force and the Navy have for a long time been flying high-altitude, airborne electronic attack capabilities like some of the ones you mentioned. What they do is fly at 30,000 feet, usually or so, maybe even above, maybe a little bit below -- about 30,000 feet, and they transmit on very powerful capabilities, and they jam a whole lot of stuff on the ground. So they have a huge footprint on the ground.

They were designed to do suppression of enemy air defense. They were designed to protect strategic assets, bombers, long-range strike capabilities, et cetera, from air-to-ground missiles -- excuse me, from ground-to-air missiles and other ground-to-air threats. So what they did for those other aircrafts, the weapons aircraft, they put a sort of protective bubble around them and they jammed the stuff on the ground.

Well, if you would consider now that the average division size element -- you know, a few BCTs they got plus the headquarters -- has over 72,000 emitters and collectors, you can imagine what a 30,000- foot jammer can do to all of those.

So the bottom line is what we find is it's going after -- if we want to go after a target on the ground, somebody who's trying to go after us with electronic attack capabilities, or if we want to stop an IED from blowing up or something like that, going after it with one of the Air Force or the Navy airborne platforms is I'm trying to hit a mosquito with a sledgehammer. You may get the mosquito, but you're going to cause a lot of other effects with that sledgehammer as well. Our Army could not be more net-centric than any other on the face of the earth right now. You know, our credo as soldiers is to move, shoot, communicate. So if we can't communicate, if we don't have active and capable battle command systems, if we don't have collection capabilities to enable targeting, then we're blind and deaf; we can't operate. And that is unfortunately what some of these airborne assets do.

So we need to have surgical on-the-ground assets to complement our capability of emitters and collectors so we can, as I said earlier, go out and get the enemy first, or stop him from getting us on the ground.

But I think what you said, though, really shows a point -- there's been a sea change, a huge paradigm shift in the understanding of EW because for decades it's been run from the air. But now that you have an asymmetric ground battle -- not the Cold War anymore -- people are beginning to understand that there are a plethora of targets in and about any, you know, square kilometer on the ground, you know, in either theater right now, or other -- potentially at

theaters like AFRICOM. And we have to protect ourselves and be able to attack from a ground point of view. Does that make sense?

Q Yeah. What kind of technology are we talking about that exists right now for such local effects?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Well, some of them are the jammers we have out there. We use jammers to prevent the detonation of IEDs. We use jammers out there to prevent communications. When the enemy can't talk to each other to coordinate a fight, or to coordinate an escape, to coordinate an activity, it certainly helps us in our offensive or defensive actions, whatever we want to do at the time.

We have airborne technologies that are UAS-based, UAV-based. So instead of having something at 30,000 feet, you can have something controlled by the local tactical commander. So if he wants to do some communications jamming in support of one of his operations, he can do just that instead of having the asset come in and blank out half the theater with a footprint.

So we are seeing comms electronic attacks. We're seeing directed energy capabilities. We're seeing laser capabilities. We can shoot down incoming munitions with lasers. We have something called active denial systems that puts out a directed energy pulse that is harmless but not something you want to get in front of. And it keeps people out of a certain area. It's an area denial system.

So we have a whole lot of capabilities out there that use the electromagnetic spectrum, not just the communications spectrum in ways that are very beneficial to the U.S. Army.

Q Okay, so EW, as you're visualizing it, is going to include lasers, microwaves, not just radio, cell phones, things like that. COL. BUCKHOUT: Absolutely, absolutely. There's a whole lot of technology in the area. Again, it's not something that most folks are reading about in The Washington Post or in The Times or anything, but it's actually very accessible. It's at high technology levels that can be quickly used by the services. It's pretty exciting stuff.

Q Great.

Thank you.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Thank you.

MS. KYZER: Okay. We had some folks join us after we got started. Is there anyone else in line with a question who hasn't asked one yet?

Q Hey, Lindy. I've got one. This is CJ.

MS. KYZER: Hi, CJ.

Q How are you doing, ma'am? How are you doing? This is CJ from A Soldier's Perspective.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Hey, First Sergeant. How are you?

Q Oh, hi. Oh, great.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Good.

Q You know me.

COL. BUCKHOUT: I do. I do. And I'm really pleased to hear you. Thanks for coming on.

Q Thanks. Now, I was just about two minutes late, so you may have already addressed this, ma'am. But being an electronic warfare guy myself -- I'm a prior SIGINT -- my question is, is this electronic warfare stuff going to be fielded with existing equipment, or recreating all new equipment, or fielding all new equipment? And as a follow-on to that, if it is new equipment that is in production right now, how does that square with our commander in chief's decision to kind of stall future combat systems and things like that. How does that fit in?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Oh, those are great questions. First off, you're in the perfect career field to understand this stuff. And I see from your bio you have a 14-year career and you're already a first sergeant, so huh (ph).

Q They sell the rank at the PX. COL. BUCKHOUT: (Chuckles.) That's where I got mine. Well, I think for starters, if you look at the equipment that's out there right now doing some of the EA stuff, electronic attack stuff, you know as a SIGINT, you have some very sophisticated surgical capabilities that are often kept at very high classification levels.

Q Roger.

COL. BUCKHOUT: What we don't have, however, is a more democratic capability. What we have now is crew, and you know about crew; that's counter-RCID electronic warfare. Those are those jammers. And they are crewed, and very fratricidal to comms and probably to some of your collection efforts too. And what we've been seeing in a lot of studies over the last half decade is that we need to have something crew-plus. We need to have a capability that is not as heavy, expensive, or, you know, single-purposed as crew but enables electronic attack in different echelons. You know, if you have to do a dismounted op and you got to go into a -- you know, clear a small village, clear a building, and you're dismounting infantry soldiers, you can use a small dismounted jammer to suppress comms, or even suppress a certain frequency of comms, or even do comms hurting while you're going into that area. You know what I mean?

Q Roger.

COL. BUCKHOUT: EMP grenades. If you want to go into a compound and you don't want to kill everybody of course but you want to stun them and be able to do what you've got to do, hey, do an EMP grenade. You know, if you want to stop engines and vehicles -- I mean, all of this stuff is out there right now.

So we see as we get out of the crew business and get into EW business writ large, we see a big equipment change capitalizing on crew but getting into something better. We also see of course the SIGINT mission going on undeterred and even augmented because even all of this hardware requirement for EA means more ES, more SIGINT, more targeting.

Also a note on our commander in chief, he made a really interesting point, and I just called it up on Google here. What did he talk about? Okay.

Here's what President Obama said I think last month: "We must adapt and make tradeoffs among systems originally designed for the Cold War and those required for current and future challenges. We need greater investment in advanced technology ranging from the revolutionary, like unmanned area vehicles and electronic warfare capabilities to systems like the C-17 cargo, et cetera, et cetera."

So, you know what, I'm taking that comment as right in line as the Army's way ahead, and our mantra is change.

Q Roger. Thank you, ma'am. COL. BUCKHOUT: Thank you.

MS. KYZER: Okay. Any other questions?

Q This is Sean Gallagher from Forward Observer and thepacketrat.com.

MS. KYZER: Go ahead, Sean.

Q I wanted to ask how the new MOS integrates with the Army's plans for network warfare, the cyber side?

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know, that's a great question. Right now we're tying partially into the OSD guidance. Of course we're playing with OSD guidance of course within it. But OSD guidance came out a couple of months ago and said that cyber is the interconnected network of servers, et cetera, that moves data around, but it doesn't necessarily include electronic warfare.

We see cyber and EW as connected, but not the same thing. One of the challenges we're running into cyber right now is that cyber policy exists at some very high levels. If you want to go out and attack somebody on a network, that's a very high level policy decision to make, whereas electronic warfare is done by tactical commanders to achieve immediate tactical effects.

If a BCT or a battalion commander wants to do an operation, as I said earlier, and he needs to do some comms hurting -- you know, getting the enemy off one frequency and onto another so he can hear them, that's where he would make the decision at that O-5, O-4, O-3, E-7 level to go ahead and proceed with that attack. However, if you wanted to do actions on the Internet or you wanted to go after somebody else's servers, et cetera, that would require an entirely different echelon of approval and timing and processes.

So we're seeing EW much more as a tactically effects-based capability -- CNO, highly valuable, more of a strategic asset at this point. Does that make sense?

Q Yeah it does. I guess as a follow-up to that, I wanted to ask about the idea of cyber effects on the battlefield in terms of -- you've got asymmetric threats out there that are using Internet technology on mobile communications platforms like cellular and things like that. How does SIGINT on the cyber world play into the EW side, and how do you handle things like the intercept of what might be locally related -- tactically related information in the cyber realm than pulling it into the EW realm?

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know, that's an interesting point. There are a lot of SIGINT (terminal ?) guidance teams, SIGINT teams, Intel teams who are out there in the field right now at lower and lower echelons, at BCT level, et

cetera, who are able to process intercepts, do a quick turn at NCA for analysis, and then have it back out into the field for targeting within minutes. So they're doing a fantastic job on those capabilities.

Our thoughts are that when something passes from the cyber realm into the wireless realm, then it's open season for EW. So if you're using a cell phone network to transmit something off of a PC or a laptop in a cafe, say, that's certainly open to any sort of gaming intercept, et cetera, that you might have going through the open air. Does that make sense?

Q It makes sense to me.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Okay.

Q Thank you, Colonel.

MS. KYZER: Okay. Any other questions?

Q Hi. This is from Kico. Is any integration with the civilian agencies, like CIA and NSA?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Kico, that would primarily reside with the SIGINT community, as I bet First Sergeant can tell you, CJ, because of the classification, the need-to-know, and the targets that they're exploiting. For the tactical commander, he wouldn't necessarily have a great view into that, nor would the CIA or other three-letter agencies have a great view into what he's doing in the open side that I deal with from the standard operator. The SIGINTers, the Intel world, NSA net, other three-letter agencies, will be working through their channels to bring those awarenesses to the battlefield; that wouldn't necessarily be my job.

MS. KYZER: Okay, and other questions?

Q Lindy, I'm sorry. What was that question? I was receiving an e-mail?

COL. BUCKHOUT: (Chuckles.)

Q I heard my name, but I missed the -- I heard the answer but not the question?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Hey, CJ. He was talking about how three-letter agencies weigh into what I do, and I was actually pointing it more back to you saying that's more your business than mine from the collection targeting and three-letter agency net perspectives. Does that make sense to you?

Q Oh, yes, ma'am. We work very closely together, especially as it comes relating to this kind of stuff.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Thanks for keeping me straight -- (inaudible).

Q This is Chuck. I've got another question.

Q Yeah, I've got a question. This is Bryant Jordan, military.com.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Okay.

Q Go ahead, Bryant.

Q Thank you. Thank you much. Again, I also walked in a few minutes after you started discussing this. Did you describe how this specialty will fit into the current unit structure?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Yup. We have them in some battalions but in most BCTs. BCT will have -- well, a brigade combat team will have an enlisted, warrant, and officer at each team who is in charge of the non-kinetics targeting cell, effects cell. You'll have them at division core. You'll have them at Army Service Component Command. And we're in the process of building joint billets as well. So they will be distributed from four-star command level down to battalions, although not all battalions -- unfortunately we don't have the numbers yet.

And so we'll be distributing throughout the force. We did that for two reasons, or for several. The first reason is that they're needed. TRADOC spent a couple of years analyzing this beast inside and out and the final analysis was we simply have to have them, and the Army has to bite the bullet in force structure to build them in.

The second reason why they're imbedded in all of those places is that when we began to realize we needed them, we began to realize, well, if we're going to have them, you got to have valid career structures meaning that at NCO can rise to be a sergeant major; a warrant officer can rise to be a W-4 or W-5, and an officer can rise to be an O-5 or an O-6. So we have -- it's called a valid career pyramid in personnel speak. So we have those for all three specialties across the ranks to make sure that EWs can continue to grow and develop.

Q Thank you.

MS. KYZER: And Chuck?

Q Two quick questions. First of all, is there actually an EMP grenade available right now? COL. BUCKHOUT: The technologies are out there. I have never had my hands on one. I'm not sure I want to.

Q My next question is going to be do you have a tentative list of the toys that your EW cell is going to take with it to the brigade combat team? Do you have a -- I'm not military so I don't know what the technical term is, but -- you know, a list of the technical equipment that they will have access to? Do you have that yet?

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know what, where we stand right now is the analysis of all of the materiel capabilities that the Department of Defense is going to need on EW. And I say Department of Defense because this electronic warfare topic has gained so much interest that OSD and the Joint Staff has commissioned a study done through STRATCOM. So all of the services have participated on a materiel study to see where and what kind of equipment do we need. So that's going to come out in April with a full list of gaps and some identified solutions.

So I can't tell you exactly everything right now until that study is released. It will encompass ground systems, low aerial systems, such as UAVs. It will encompass mid-flight -- high-level UAVs. It will encompass airborne electronic attack, large platforms, and it may even delve into space systems.

So what you will see is a complete echeloning of capabilities across DOD that we need to have in electronic warfare. And the Army will have their complement of course.

Q Okay. And when will the first person be in this MOS?

COL. BUCKHOUT: We -- hold on. Let me look at my talking points here. Probably at the end of FY '10.

Q Which is September 2011?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Which is -- end of FY '10. No, that's around September '10 -- around September of '10, so about a year and a half from now. What that means is that takes the time to get the people recruited, accessed, trained -- because the schools are already up and running -- trained, et cetera, and then they come out at the end of the cycle, and they get the stamp on them as an EWO.

Q Great. Thank you.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Now, hey, Chuck. One final note: We are going to accelerate that based upon the needs of the field. Right now we have some Navy and Air Force EWOs filling our mission out there. But, you know, an Army guy is just -- you know, you can't be a soldier on the ground. That's what we do. So we are anxious to get soldiers out there on the ground doing this job. Q Great.

MS. KYZER: Okay. And any final questions out there?

Q One last -- (inaudible) -- question. This is Sean Gallagher. How far along is TRADOC in developing the materials for the training?

COL. BUCKHOUT: TRADOC has programs of instruction for all three courses.

And they have already run two -- well, they have run a pilot course for the officer course and another one is in session right now. And they also have already developed -- they have been running for two years an ASI course, additional skill identifier. So they run a six- week and a three-week course on EW, and have been doing so for two years.

And as a plug for those courses, just briefly, they have trained a couple of thousand joint personnel, and in fact, all of the Navy and Air Force guys who go over to theater to fill in as Army EWOs go through those courses because they do such a good job and bring them up to speed on ground EW.

So, yeah, TRADOC is on top of it. They're doing a great job.

Q Thank you, Colonel.

MS. KYZER: I thought I heard one other question.

Q Yeah, I was going to ask you -- you mentioned when the first person will be filling a job in this. How long do you think it will take before the career field is up to strength?

COL. BUCKHOUT: FY '11.

Q Oh, okay. Very good.

COL. BUCKHOUT: I think you'll have a good solid cadre in about two years, maybe a little bit less.

Q All righty.

COL. BUCKHOUT: And most of that is just admin stuff -- you know, accessing them, promoting them, getting them into the MOS, changing their paperwork, all of that kind of stuff. You know, anybody who's been in the Army knows that's where the real pain is.

Q I have a follow-up. With the training for the officers that have been going on, when will the first enlisted course be conducted? COL. BUCKHOUT: We're thinking probably -- in fact, let me look at my notes here. The officer course is up and running. What do you think on the enlisted course?

Q April.

COL. BUCKHOUT: April?

Q Pilot.

Q Pilot.

COL. BUCKHOUT: We're going to have a pilot course April of this year.

Q Outstanding.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Yup. So again TRADOC is doing a great job. Pretty big stuff.

Q And how many soldiers will be in the pilot course?

COL. BUCKHOUT: I will predict no more than a dozen. It might be more than that, but typically they're kept small and they build on them and build them the experiences out of there. So I would predict about a dozen or so. We might have some huge influx. But the problem really is with the Army right now, the Army is -- I mean, we're all fighting, you know, and so having a bunch of soldiers free to go do pilot courses is just not something we can do right now.

Q Right. Now, will those -- will that be volunteers or will that be -- are you going to be going actively recruiting certain MOSs that you think could naturally transition into it?

COL. BUCKHOUT: We'll be doing volunteers.

Q Volunteers.

COL. BUCKHOUT: You know, there's been no lack of that. When we first came out a couple of years ago with the decision to start creating the MOS, soldiers were jumping on it left and right. You have a bunch of really smart kids out there, and they see this as a way to expand into whole new technologies. And, you know, just like the new commander in chief said, this is a way to get out of old-style Cold War business and to get into something new.

Q So are these new accessions or are these re-classes?

COL. BUCKHOUT: They'll probably do re-class because we're looking at junior NCOs to bring in or senior re-force to bring in from the beginning.

Q So the class is going to be basically E-4 through E-6, E-7. COL. BUCKHOUT: Yeah. That's it.

Q If you need any first sergeants, I volunteer. (Laughter.)

COL. BUCKHOUT: Be careful what you ask for. We'd love to have you.

Q Thank you, ma'am.

COL. BUCKHOUT: Thank you.

MS. KYZER: Okay, well, thank you everyone for your questions. We had a very dynamic conversation here. I appreciate your all taking the time to join us. Colonel, do you have any closing remarks or anything we didn't touch on that you'd like to add?

COL. BUCKHOUT: Well, that was just fun for starters, and I really appreciated being a part of it. I really enjoyed it. Just that that we're moving ahead. I appreciate the chance to talk about this because the Army has gone in the last three years from very little electronic warfare capability to the largest cadre of all of the services. So I think we're on a role. I think the new administration is going to support the direction we're going in. So thank you very much.

Q Thank you so much.

MS. KYZER: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you everyone for joining us today. Bye.

END.